Mathematical Goal Theory

mami ich habe dir ein bild gemalt.
was ist denn das?
das ist die mathematical goal theory.
omg

very simple. imagine any idea that should become a goal like figuring out what a quantum beever is. any idea known to man has some knowledge nodes. any idea must have some other idea preexisting (ignore babies they dont know what a goal is). in our example we might know what quantum means and mightve heard of the beever mammal. approach is as follows: we substitute any knowledge node figuratively with some variable. a knowledge node is some fact about the idea: an experiment run that has to do with qp, something weve read or heard, some intuitive categorizations. KN connect to other nodes using more information input and piece by piece an knowledge map is formed, refined or (re)strengthened. now in order to figure out what the qb is human kind starts exploring the vast oceans, digging tunnels through moutnains and burning down jungles to find out more about this creature. here and there youll find something useful that hasnt been found yet but most of the time you connect old known nodes with the ones youve ascribed to the idea and refine or reform sometimes even eliminating constraints. often borrowing kn from neighboring disciplines, rarer from those who had seemingly no connection at all. in the end what it comes down to is that any idea is not a thing but a pattern that does not serve a purpose. we do not engage in some fantastic journey to explore our universe, we only follow patterns sometimes constraining sometimes inviting. these patterns are what should concern us. they are the ones that keep us in check, hold us down, make us repeat the same mistake (thinking those patterns mean sth) over and over, over generations!
there is only one thing that bothers me: its that some theories can actually be useful in a practical sense. but isnt it just something like a hindsight bias if we observe and create a theory? - its about those theories that have been made where a lot has been proven but a lot of parts were wrong. think about it. couldnt it be random (an extreme opinion guy would say)? that merely thinking about an idea based on known facts we philosophize around in the knowledge map. can we actually foresee things? isnt it very easily possible to change one variable and stumble upon some knew knowledge? isnt this what we were

meant to do? find patterns to become more efficient at hunting and survival. but what now that i know that science is about patterns and using them instead of finding whats beyond that. that is for philos to find out. (i have a feeling i wrote about those patterns before)
probably im too stupid to see the consequence of saying this out loud. someones figured that this should be told to keep the innocent living. im just too broken to care for their dream. i want mine to end.

here to the spider formalism:
given a goal !G
given an idea of G !I
I has attached known facts F_x they are directly related
hence between I and each F exists a path
towards lim G the the paths from I change
some Fs values change
some Fs get new F facts on their path
some Fs are completely removes
that way a web of Fs exists (or node map)
that way a spider I with F number of legs (or knees) moves towards G
cool
231110 1EEREmENGE0

the drawings dont quite fit (idea version 1 and 2)
although the right one are fact branches where each branch gives numerous opportunities for new facts that with time/knowledge each fact becomes itself an idea with its constraints, new nodes etc.